

GORDON H. DePAOLI  
Nevada State Bar No. 0195  
DALE E. FERGUSON  
Nevada State Bar No. 4986  
WOODBURN AND WEDGE  
6100 Neil Road, Suite 500  
Post Office Box 2311  
Reno, Nevada 89511  
Telephone: (775) 688-3000

Attorneys for Defendant,  
WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	In Equity No. C-125-ECR
	)	Subfile No. C-125-B
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE,	)	
	)	<b>WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION</b>
Plaintiff-Intervenor,	)	<b>DISTRICT'S RESPONSE TO MOTION</b>
	)	<b>TO MODIFY CASE MANAGEMENT</b>
v.	)	<b>ORDER IN THE C-125-B CASE</b>
	)	
WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT,	)	
a corporation, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Cross-Defendants David Haight and Tom Reviglio have filed a Motion to Modify Case Management Order (the "Motion"). The Motion includes several requests. One is to require parties to make initial disclosures of the legal bases for their claims and defenses within sixty (60) days of modification of the Case Management Order. Another is to allow document discovery immediately. Another is to allow dispositive motions by any party, apparently, at

1 any time, based on the initial disclosures and documents produced. The Motion suggests a  
2 mechanism and procedure for making document requests, responses, documents produced and  
3 other pleadings available to parties joined after the fact. Finally, the Motion includes a vague  
4 discussion concerning preservation of the status quo while litigation is pending.

5  
6 The Walker River Irrigation District (the "District") was a participant in the process  
7 which resulted in the entry of the Case Management Order on April 18, 2000. That Order was  
8 entered after the filing of simultaneous motions, responses to motions, and replies from the  
9 District and Nevada, California, the United States, and the Walker River Tribe. Although the  
10 Order recognizes that the Magistrate Judge may change, modify and adjust it from time to time,  
11 such changes, modifications and adjustments should not alter the fundamental decisions made  
12 by the Court for the management of this matter without good and sufficient reason. That said,  
13 the District agrees that it is now time to undertake such procedures as may be necessary "so that  
14 the action may proceed as promptly as possible upon conclusion of service of process" as  
15 directed in the Case Management Order. *See*, Case Management Order, para. (11), pg. 9, lns.  
16 15-17.

17  
18 In the judgment of the District, the Case Management Order, as presently written, and  
19 without need for modification, provides ample authority and discretion for the Magistrate Judge  
20 to take such actions as may be necessary to meet the above objective and to allow Phase I of  
21 these proceedings to commence promptly on completion of service. In order to begin that  
22 process, the District suggests that the Magistrate Judge consider the actions described below.

23  
24 **II. PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH (6) OF THE CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER,**  
25 **THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE SHOULD NOW ESTABLISH A SCHEDULE**  
26 **FOR COMPLETION OF SERVICE OF PROCESS.**

27 Paragraph (6) of the Case Management Order allows the Magistrate Judge to "establish  
28 a schedule for completion of service of process which may be modified by further order from  
time to time as appropriate." Case Management Order, para. (6), pg. 7, lns. 5-7. The District

1 recognizes that in April of 2000 it was impossible to establish a realistic schedule for  
 2 completion of service of process. However, several years have passed since the Court first  
 3 authorized the United States and the Tribe to begin service of process, and significant progress  
 4 has been made by them in that service. Establishment of a target date now for completion of  
 5 service would be helpful for the Court and the parties to begin to do those things necessary to  
 6 allow this action to proceed as promptly as possible on completion of service of process under  
 7 the procedures established in the Case Management Order.

9 **III. PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH (10) OF THE CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER,**  
 10 **THE COURT SHOULD DIRECT THE PARTIES BY A DATE CERTAIN TO**  
 11 **JOINTLY OR SEPARATELY RECOMMEND PROCEDURES TO THE COURT**  
 12 **FOR SERVICE OF PLEADINGS ON PARTIES TO THE LITIGATION, AND**  
 13 **FOR MAKING DISCOVERY REQUESTS, DISCOVERY RESPONSES, AND**  
 14 **DOCUMENTS PRODUCED AVAILABLE TO THE PARTIES TO THIS**  
 15 **LITIGATION.**

16 Paragraph (10) of the Case Management Order provides as follows:

17 Following completion of service of process on the said counterclaims, the  
 18 Magistrate Judge shall receive recommendations of the parties for procedures  
 19 for scheduling and for the efficient management of the litigation given the  
 20 number of parties to the case. Such procedures may include the use of common  
 21 counsel, special procedures for service of pleadings, or any other mechanisms  
 22 deemed likely to reduce the burdens on the parties and the court in a case of this  
 23 magnitude.

24 Case Management Order, para. (10), pg. 8, lns. 19-26.

25 Although paragraph (10) of the Case Management Order contemplates that these  
 26 recommendations be made following completion of service, it seems prudent that the Court  
 27 begin to receive those recommendations at this time. Indeed, previously, the parties had  
 28 commenced to consider such procedures.

29 Much of what the pending Motion requests depends upon having in place special  
 30 procedures for making pleadings, discovery requests, discovery responses, and documents  
 31 produced available to the hundreds of parties in this case, many of whom are not represented by  
 32 counsel. The Motion includes a proposal to establish a website for purposes of posting requests

for production of documents, responses to requests for production of documents, and copies of documents produced, as well as making such information available at various public places within the area affected by this litigation. That proposal needs further analysis and evaluation with respect to its cost and how those costs might be funded. In addition, the efficacy of the proposal needs additional evaluation. Therefore, the Court should establish a schedule by which the parties would jointly or separately recommend procedures that encompass the need to have mechanisms for service of pleadings on, and making discovery available to, all parties to this action, particularly those who have filed a Notice of Appearance and Intent to Participate, but who have not engaged counsel.

**IV. PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH (11) OF THE CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER, THE COURT SHOULD ESTABLISH A SCHEDULE FOR SUBMISSION OF A LIST OF THRESHOLD ISSUES BY THE PARTIES, AND FOR MAKING A PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION OF THE THRESHOLD ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED AT THE OUTSET OF THE LITIGATION.**

Paragraph (11) of the Case Management Order provides:

As soon as convenient after the entry of this order, and upon appropriate notice to the parties presently appearing in the case, the Magistrate Judge shall consider and make a preliminary determination of the threshold issues to be addressed at the outset of the litigation on the U.S./Tribe said counterclaims. Scheduling of such consideration shall go forward notwithstanding other proceedings provided for in this order. The list of threshold issues regarding said claims will not be finally resolved and settled by the Magistrate Judge until all appropriate parties are joined. Nevertheless, the parties are directed to identify all potential threshold issues promptly and to submit them to the Magistrate Judge for consideration, as he shall direct, so that action may proceed as promptly as possible upon conclusion of service of process.

Case Management Order at para. (11), pg. 9, lns. 4 -17.

Initially, the Court should direct the United States and the Tribe to disclose the bases for the Tribal Claims. The pending Motion would have all parties make an initial disclosure of the legal bases for their claims and defenses simultaneously within sixty (60) days of modification of the Case Management Order. In order to identify threshold issues not included in the Case Management Order, it is appropriate, and probably necessary, for the Tribe and the United

1 States to first disclose the legal bases for their claims. With that information, the parties will be  
 2 in a better position to suggest, and the Magistrate Judge will be in a better position to consider  
 3 and make a preliminary determination of, threshold issues to be addressed at the outset of the  
 4 litigation.

5  
 6 **V. ADJUSTMENTS, IF ANY, TO THE PROVISIONS IN THE CASE**  
 7 **MANAGEMENT ORDER WITH RESPECT TO DISCOVERY, FINAL**  
 8 **IDENTIFICATION OF THRESHOLD ISSUES, AND FILING OF DISPOSITIVE**  
 9 **MOTIONS, SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED UNLESS AND UNTIL THE**  
 10 **COURT HAS MADE A DETERMINATION OF THE PROCEDURES TO BE**  
 11 **FOLLOWED WITH RESPECT TO SERVICE OF PLEADINGS AND OTHER**  
 12 **SPECIAL PROCEDURES FOR THE EFFICIENT MANAGEMENT OF THE**  
 13 **LITIGATION.**

14 In 2000, the District took the position that the Case Management Order should allow  
 15 "any party, at any time, to propound interrogatories and requests for production of documents  
 16 to the United States and the Tribe concerning their contentions with respect to the claims  
 17 alleged in their amended counterclaims." *See*, Joint Motion Concerning Case Management of  
 18 Walker River Irrigation District, and State of Nevada and Proposed Order Concerning Case  
 19 Management attached thereto as Exhibit A at paragraph 16 filed January 21, 2000. However,  
 20 in response to that position, the Court in paragraph (15) of the Case Management Order  
 21 determined as follows:

22 Once the Magistrate Judge has finally determined the threshold issues, discovery  
 23 shall be allowed to all parties on the threshold issues. Discovery shall also be  
 24 permitted during that same time period concerning the basis for the Tribal  
 25 Claims; such discovery shall be limited to propounding of interrogatories and  
 26 requests for production of documents relating to the contentions of the  
 27 U.S./Tribe with respect to the basis for the tribal Claims.

28 The District continues to believe that discovery should be permitted with respect to the  
 bases for the Tribal Claims. It recognizes, however, the need for effective procedures for  
 making service of that discovery on all parties, as well as making the responses to such  
 discovery available to all parties. The District also recognizes that the United States and the  
 Tribe should not be required to respond multiple times to identical discovery requests. The

1 Motion also recognizes that the procedures for service on all parties must be determined and in  
2 place in order to facilitate such discovery. Therefore, those procedures must be determined  
3 before discovery proceeds.

4 **VI. THE COURT SHOULD NOT OTHERWISE MODIFY THE CASE**  
5 **MANAGEMENT ORDER.**

6 Although it is not entirely clear, it seems that the Motion contemplates a change to the  
7 Case Management Order that would allow parties to bring dispositive motions on any legal  
8 basis, at any time, regardless of whether the dispositive motion is related to a threshold issue.  
9 The framework of the Case Management Order related to initial disposition of threshold issues  
10 should be maintained going forward. Some threshold issues may, in fact, involve matters  
11 which are dispositive of all or some portion of the Tribal Claims. However, dispositive  
12 motions unrelated to threshold issues would be an extreme departure from the Case  
13 Management Order, and is not justified at this time.

15 The Motion also includes a vague statement concerning maintenance of the status quo  
16 while the litigation is pending. There is insufficient information in that portion of the Motion  
17 for the District to understand what is contemplated by it. Moreover, the Proposed Order  
18 Amending Case Management Order includes no reference to maintenance of the status quo. If,  
19 at some point in time, a party believes that some sort of injunctive relief is required to preserve  
20 the status quo, the party or parties may file an appropriate motion with the Court which  
21 identifies the acts which the Court is being requested to enjoin, and sets forth the facts on which  
22

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///



1 the request is based. In that fashion, the requirements of Rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil  
2 Procedure and related case law will be satisfied.

3 Date: May 14, 2007

WOODBURN AND WEDGE

4  
5  
6 By: 

Gordon DePaoli

Dale Ferguson

Woodburn and Wedge

6100 Neil Rd., #500

Reno, NV 89511-1149

775/688-3000

*Attorneys for Walker River Irrigation District*

11  
12 **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

13 I certify that I am an employee of Woodburn and Wedge and that on the 14th day of  
14 May, 2007, I electronically filed the foregoing *Walker River Irrigation District's Response to*  
15 *Motion to Modify Case Management Order in the C-125-B Case* with the Clerk of the Court  
16 using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to the following via their  
17 email addresses:

18 Marta Adams  
maadams@ag.state.nv.us

19  
20 Greg Addington  
greg.addington@usdoj.gov

21 George Benesch  
gbenesch@sbcglobal.net

22  
23 Brian Chally  
brian.chally@lvvwd.com

24  
25 Ross E. de Lipkau  
RdeLipkau@parsonsbehle.com

26 William J. Duffy  
william.duffy@dgslaw.com

27  
28 Andrew Galvin  
drew.galvin@americantower.com

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Sylvia Harrison  
sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com

Simeon Herskovits  
herskovitx@westernlaw.org

John W. Howard  
johnh@jwhowardattorneys.com

Michael D. Hoy  
mhoy@nevadalaw.com

Kirk C. Johnson  
kirk@nvlawyers.com, chris@nvlawyers.com

Debbie Leonard  
dshosteck@mcdonaldcarano.com

Michael F. Mackedon  
falonlaw@phonewave.net

Erin K.L. Mahaney  
emahaney@waterboards.ca.gov

Malissa Hathaway McKeith  
mckeith@lbbslaw.com

Michael R. Montero  
mrm@eloreno.com

Marvin W. Murphy  
marvinmurphy@sbcglobal.net

David L. Negri  
david.negri@usdoj.gov

Michael W. Neville  
michael.neville@doj.ca.gov, wallace.greene@doj.ca.gov

Michael A. Pagni  
mpagni@mcdonaldcarano.com

Karen A. Peterson  
kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com, egarrison@allisonmackenzie.com

G. David Robertson  
gdavid@nvlawyers.com



1 James Spoo  
2 spootoo@aol.com

3 John P. Schlegelmilch  
4 jpslaw@netscape.com

5 Susan Schneider  
6 susan.schneider@usdoj.gov

7 Laura Schroeder  
8 counsel@water-law.com

9 Sheri M. Schwartz  
10 ajarvis@lbbslaw.com

11 Stacey Simon  
12 ssimon@mono.ca.gov

13 Julian C. Smith, Jr.  
14 joylyn@smithandharmer.com  
15 Bryan L. Stockton  
16 blstockt@ag.state.nv.us

17 J.D. Sullivan  
18 jd@mindenlaw.com

19 Harry W. Swainston  
20 hwsainston@earthlink.net

21 Wes Williams  
22 wwilliams@stanfordalumni.org

23 Charles S. Zumpft  
24 zumpft@brooke-shaw.com

25 and I further certify that I served a copy of the foregoing to the following non-CM/ECF  
26 participants by U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, this 14th day of May, 2007:

27 Allen Biaggi  
28 Dir. of Conservation & Natural Resources  
State of Nevada  
901 S. Stewart St.  
Carson City, NV 89701

William W. Quinn  
Office of the Field Solicitor  
Department of the Interior  
401 W. Washington St., SPC 44  
Phoenix, AZ 85003

Wesley G. Beverlin  
Malissa Hathaway McKeith  
Lewis, Brisbois, Bisgaard & Smith LCP

Hugh Ricci, P.E.  
Division of Water Resources  
State of Nevada

1 221 N. Figueroa St., Suite 1200  
2 Los Angeles, CA 90012

3 Cheri Emm-Smith  
4 Mineral County District Attorney  
5 P. O. Box 1210  
Hawthorne, NV 89415

6 Tim Glidden  
7 U. S. Dept. of the Interior, Office of the  
8 Secretary, Div. Of Indian Affairs  
9 1849 C St. N.W.  
Mail Stop 6456  
Washington, D.C. 20240

10 Nathan Goedde, Staff Counsel  
11 California Dept. of Fish and Game  
12 1416 Ninth St., #1335  
Sacramento, CA 95814

13 Mary Hackenbracht  
14 Deputy Attorney General  
15 State of California  
16 1515 Clay St., 20<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Oakland, CA 94612-1413

17 John Kramer  
18 Dept. of Water Resources  
19 1416 Ninth St.  
Sacramento, CA 95814

20 Todd Plimpton  
21 Belanger & Plimpton  
22 1135 Central Ave.  
23 P.O. Box 59  
Lovelock, NV 89419

901 S. Stewart St.  
Carson City, NV 89701

Marshall S. Rudolph, Mono County Counsel  
Stacy Simon, Deputy County Counsel  
Mono County  
P. O. Box 2415  
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546-2415


Steve Rye  
Chief Deputy District Attorney  
Lyon County  
31 S. Main St.  
Yerington, NV 89447

William E. Schaeffer  
P. O. Box 936  
Battle Mountain, NV 89820

James Shaw  
Water Master  
U.S. Board of Water Commissioners  
P.O. Box 853  
Yerington, NV 89447

Kenneth Spooner  
General Manager  
Walker River Irrigation District  
P.O. Box 820  
Yerington, NV 89447

Garry Stone  
United States District Court Water Master  
290 S. Arlington Ave., 3rd Floor  
Reno, NV 89501

24  
25  
26   
27 Holly Dewar  
28